



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,394	01/31/2001	Lars Wiklund	P/2432-37	5538

7590 01/18/2006

Edward A Meilman  
Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky llp  
1177 Avenue of the Americas 41st Floor  
New York, NY 10036-2714

EXAMINER

WANG, SHENGJUN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/773,394

Applicant(s)

WIKLUND ET AL.

Examiner

Shengjun Wang

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the remand by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences issued August 30, 2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejections are set forth below.

#### *Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites "pharmaceutical agents consisting essentially of (a) a first composition containing at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha—ketoglutaric acid and being devoid of ammonium, and (b) a second composition containing ammonium and be devoid of a alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid" Claim 15 recites "pharmaceutical dosage unit comprising a first pharmaceutical composition comprising at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha—ketoglutaric acid in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and being devoid of ammonium, and a second pharmaceutical composition comprising ammonium in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and be devoid of a alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid" Interpreted broadly, the claims read on separate compositions containing alpha-ketoglutarate and ammonium respectively. However, the application, as originally filed,

Art Unit: 1617

lack support for such separate composition. Particularly, the application provide no support for “composition containing at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha—ketoglutaric acid and *being devoid* of ammonium,” “composition containing ammonium and *being devoid* of a alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid,” in claim 1, and “pharmaceutical composition comprising at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha—ketoglutaric acid in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and being devoid of ammonium,” “pharmaceutical composition comprising ammonium in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and being devoid of a alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid” in claim 15.

***Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 102***

4. Claims 1, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Veech (USPN 5,719,119).

The claims are directed to a dosage unit (a composition) comprising at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid and ammonium, and the method of using the same.

Note, “pharmaceutical agents consisting essentially of (a) a first composition containing at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha—ketoglutaric acid and being devoid of ammonium, and (b) a second composition containing ammonium and be devoid of a alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid” (claim 1), and “pharmaceutical dosage unit comprising a first pharmaceutical composition comprising at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha—ketoglutaric acid in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and being devoid of ammonium, and a second pharmaceutical composition comprising ammonium in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and be devoid of a alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid” are interpreted broadly, in view

Art Unit: 1617

of the specification, as read on a single composition comprising both alpha-ketoglutarate and ammonium, for reasons stated in the Remand by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

5. Veech (USPN 5,719,119) teaches a parenteral nutrition solution comprising alpha-ketoglutarate (1.2 mMole/L) and ammonium (1 mMole/L), see Table 9, col.20, examples 1.4-1.5. Veech also teaches the employment of the parenteral nutrition solution comprising alpha-ketoglutarate in a method of normalizing muscle and organ function, see claims 5 and 6 for example. Veech further teaches that post-traumatic or post-operative patients suffer from a negative nitrogen balance, col.7, line 55 to column 8 line 7. Veech also teaches alpha ketoglutarate and ammonium in an amino acid solution containing glutamate which can control the redox state of the mitochondria and therefore be useful in nitrogen- containing pharmaceutical compositions, see col. 13 line 5 to col. 14 line 20. The composition is for intravenous administration. See, column 21, lines 1-8.

It is noted that claim 1 is a method of preserving bodily protein stores in a catabolic patient, ***comprising*** the concomitant administration of a pair of pharmaceutical agents ***consisting essentially*** of (a) a first composition containing at least one of  $\alpha$ -ketoglutarate and  $\alpha$ -ketoglutaric acid and being devoid of ammonium, and (b) a second composition containing ammonium and being devoid of  $\alpha$ -ketoglutarate and  $\alpha$ -ketoglutaric acid, the amounts of the pair being effective to preserve skeletal muscle.

As stated in Board's remand: "While the pair of pharmaceutical agents "consists essentially of" two compositions, the overall method uses the "comprising" transitional language, which does not exclude other method steps, including administration of other compositions or compositions which do not affect the basic and novel characteristics of the two compositions. It

Art Unit: 1617

is understood that "[t]he word 'essentially' [in 'consisting essentially of'] opens the claims to the inclusion of ingredients which would not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of appellant's compositions as defined in the balance of the claim." In re Janakirama-Rao, 317 F.2d 951, 954, 137 USPQ 893, 896 (CCPA1963) (emphasis in original)." There fore the claims would read on the method disclosed by Veech.

***Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veech (USPN 5,719,119) and Vinnars (USPN 5,310,768), in further view of Taconic (<http://www.taconic.com/anmodels/spragued.htm>), and Bollish et al. (US 5,219,330).

The claims are directed to a dosage unit (a composition) comprising at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid and ammonium, and the method of using the same.

Note, "pharmaceutical agents consisting essentially of (a) a first composition containing at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha—ketoglutaric acid and being devoid of ammonium, and (b) a second composition containing ammonium and be devoid of a alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid" (claim 1), and "pharmaceutical dosage unit comprising a first pharmaceutical

Art Unit: 1617

composition comprising at least one of alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha—ketoglutaric acid in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and being devoid of ammonium, and a second pharmaceutical composition comprising ammonium in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and be devoid of a alpha-ketoglutarate and alpha-ketoglutaric acid” are interpreted broadly, in view of the specification, as read on a single composition comprising both alpha-ketoglutarate and ammonium, for reasons stated in the Remand by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

Veech (USPN 5,719,119) teaches a parenteral nutrition solution comprising carboxylic metabolite anions, such as lactate and/or alpha-Ketoglutarate, (0.1-150 mMole/L) and cation such as ammonium and sodium (0.1-150 mMole/L), See, particularly, columns 5. Particular examples comprising alpha-ketoglutarate and ammonium is disclosed. see Table 9, col.20, examples 1.4-1.5. Veech also teaches the employment of the parenteral nutrition solution comprising alpha-ketoglutarate in a method of normalizing muscle and organ function, see claims 5 and 6 for example. Veech further teaches that post-traumatic or post-operative patients suffer from a negative nitrogen balance, col.7, line 55 to column 8 line 7. Veech also teaches alpha ketoglutarate and ammonium in an amino acid solution containing glutamate which can control the redox state of the mitochondria and therefore be useful in nitrogen- containing pharmaceutical compositions, see col. 13 line 5 to col. 14 line 20. The parenteral composition is for intravenous administration. See, column 21, lines 1-8. Infusion rate of the composition to a Sprague Dawley male rat is about 2 ml/hour. It is noted Sprague Dawley male rat is normally less than 500 g in weight. See Sprague Dawley Outbred rats .

Vinnars (USPN 5,310,768) teaches a method of treatment of post operative and Post-traumatic patients for improving glutamine content in skeletal muscle and preventing the

Art Unit: 1617

reduction of protein synthesis capacity, hence also, improve the nitrogen balance and even make it positive by administering alpha-ketoglutarate, alone or in combination with other actives, see col. 2, lines 54-63 and abstract in particular. Vinnars teaches that the amount of alpha-ketoglutarate is at least 0.1g/kg body weight/day (which amounts to 312.5 micromoles/kg body weight per day), see col. 3, lines 6-12.

Veech and Vinnars do not particularly teach the dosing regimen herein in terms of micromoles per kilogram per minute, nor do they teach the administration of two separate compositions. Neither does it particularly teach the employment of a particular salt of ammonium.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a composition as disclosed by Veech, wherein the major carboxylic metabolic anion is alpha-ketoglutarate, and the cation is ammonium salt in the doses herein in a method of preserving bodily protein in catabolic patients.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ a composition as disclosed by Veech, wherein the major carboxylic metabolic anion is alpha-ketoglutarate, and the cation is ammonium salt in the doses herein in a method of preserving bodily protein in catabolic patients because both alpha-ketoglutarate and ammonium are known to be useful in methods of treating post-operative/post-traumatic patients and normalizing/preserving skeletal muscle glutamine/nitrogen content. Combining two agents which are known to be useful to improve nitrogen balance and preserve skeletal muscle individually into a single composition useful for the very same purpose is prime facie obvious. See *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069. The employment of salts of known actives is within the skill of the Skilled Artisan and is therefore



Art Unit: 1617

obvious. Furthermore, water, employed by Veech as the carrier, are both acceptable in parenteral composition and oral composition.


As to the particular concentration or dosing regimen herein, note it is well understood that optimization of effective amounts or and administrative regimens in pharmaceutical art is considered within the skill of the artisan. *Ex parte Skuballa* 12 USPQ2d 1570. Particularly, it is noted that the particular regimens herein are well within the range disclosed by the prior art. For example, assume a composition comprising 100 mMole/L each of alpha-ketoglutarate and ammonium, is administered with a infusion rate of 30 mL/hour (or 0.5 mL/min) to a Patient with 50 kg, the rate would be  $1 \mu\text{mol.kg}^{-1}.\text{min}^{-1}$ , well within the claimed range. It is well understood that “wherein the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” *In re Aller*, 220 F. 2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233,235 (CCPA 1955). Further, the optimization of a result effective parameter, e.g., effective amounts, is considered within the skill of the artisan. See, *In re Boesch and Slaney* (CCPA) 204 USPQ 215. Note normal operatable Intravenous infusion rate is in the range of 1 mL/hour to about 300 mL/hour in a duration of 1-24 hours. See, e.g., column 2, lines 55-68, column 5, lines 34-52 in Bollish et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0632. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**SHENGJUN WANG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
Shengjun Wang  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1617